

# OPTIMAL DECAY RATE FOR THE WAVE EQUATION ON A SQUARE WITH CONSTANT DAMPING ON A STRIP

REINHARD STAHN

**ABSTRACT.** We consider the damped wave equation with Dirichlet boundary conditions on the unit square parametrized by Cartesian coordinates  $x$  and  $y$ . We assume the damping  $a$  to be strictly positive and constant for  $x < \sigma$  and zero for  $x > \sigma$ . We prove the exact  $t^{-4/3}$ -decay rate for the energy of classical solutions. Our main result (Theorem 1) answers question (1) of [1, Section 2C].

## 1. INTRODUCTION

**1.1. The main result.** Let  $\square = (0, 1)^2$  be the unit square. We parametrize it by Cartesian coordinates  $x$  and  $y$ . Let  $a$  - the damping - be a function on  $\square$  which depends only on  $x$  such that  $a(x) = a_0 > 0$  for  $x < \sigma$  and  $a(x) = 0$  for  $x > \sigma$  where  $\sigma$  is some fixed number from the interval  $(0, 1)$ . We consider the damped wave equation:

$$\begin{cases} u_{tt}(t, x, y) - \Delta u(t, x, y) + 2a(x)u_t(t, x, y) = 0 & (t \in (0, \infty), (x, y) \in \square), \\ u(t, x, y) = 0 & (t \in (0, \infty), (x, y) \in \partial\square), \\ u(0, x, y) = u_0(x, y), u_t(0, x, y) = u_1(x, y) & ((x, y) \in \square). \end{cases}$$

We are interested in the energy

$$E(t, U_0) = \frac{1}{2} \int \int |\nabla u(t, x, y)|^2 + |u_t(t, x, y)|^2 \, dx dy$$

of a wave at time  $t$  with initial data  $U_0 = (u_0, u_1)$ . Let  $D = (H^2 \cap H_0^1) \times H_0^1(\square)$  denote the set of classical initial data. The purpose of this paper is to prove

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $\square$ ,  $a$  and  $E(t, U_0)$  be as above. Then  $\sup E(t, U_0)^{1/2} \approx t^{-2/3}$  where the supremum is taken over initial data  $\|U_0\|_D = 1$ .*

The exact meaning of ‘ $\approx$ ’ and other symbols is explained in Section 2. In Section 4 we show that this theorem is equivalent to Theorem 3 below. Section 3 is devoted to the proof of Theorem 3.

**Remark 2.** *The proof of Theorem 1 shows that a higher dimensional analogue is also true. That is, one can replace  $y \in \mathbb{R}$  by  $y \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$  for any natural number  $d \geq 2$ . The exact decay rate remains the same for all  $d$ .*

---

MSC2010: Primary 35B40, 47D06. Secondary 35L05, 35P20.

Keywords and phrases: damped wave equation, piecewise constant damping, energy, resolvent estimates, polynomial decay,  $C_0$ -semigroups.

**1.2. The semigroup approach.** If we set  $U = (u, u_t)$  and  $U_0 = (u_0, u_1)$  we may formulate the damped wave equation as an abstract Cauchy problem

$$\dot{U}(t) + AU(t) = 0, U(0) = U_0 \text{ where } A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ -\Delta & 2a(x) \end{pmatrix}$$

on the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H} = H_0^1 \times L^2(\square)$ . The domain of  $A$  is  $D(A) = (H^2 \cap H_0^1) \times H_0^1(\square)$ . Since  $-A$  is a dissipative (we equip  $H_0^1(\square)$  with the gradient norm) and invertible operator on a Hilbert space it generates a  $C_0$ -semigroup of contractions by the Lumer-Phillips theorem. Note that the inclusion  $D(A) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}$  is compact by the Rellich-Kondrachov theorem. Thus the spectrum of  $A$  contains only eigenvalues of finite multiplicity.

**1.3. Classification of the main result.** Our situation is a very particular instance of the so called *partially rectangular* situation. A bounded domain  $\Omega$  is called *partially rectangular* if its boundary  $\partial\Omega$  is piecewise  $C^\infty$  and if  $\Omega$  contains an open rectangle  $R$  such that two opposite sides of  $R$  are contained in  $\partial\Omega$ . We call these two opposite sides *horizontal*. One can decompose  $\overline{\Omega} = \overline{R} \cup \overline{W}$ , where  $W$  is an open set which is disjoint to  $R$ . In our particular situation we can  $W$  choose to be empty. Furthermore it is assumed, that  $a > 0$  on  $\overline{W}$  and  $a = 0$  on  $S$ , where  $S \subseteq R$  is an open rectangle with two sides contained in the horizontal sides of  $R$ . To avoid the discussion of null-sets we assume for simplicity that either  $a$  is continuous up to the boundary or it is as in subsection 1.1.

Under these constraints one can show that the energy of classical solutions can never decay uniformly faster than  $1/t^2$ , i.e.

$$(1) \quad \sup_{U_0 \in D(A)} E(t, U_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \gtrsim \frac{1}{t}.$$

This result seems to be well-known. Unfortunately we do not know an original reference to this bound on the energy. A short modern proof using [2, Proposition 1.3] can be found in [1]. But there is also a *geometric optics* proof using quantified versions of the techniques of [8]. Unfortunately the latter approach seems to be never published anywhere.

On the other hand: If we assume that the damping does not vanish completely in  $R$  (this is an additional assumption only if  $W$  is empty), then

$$(2) \quad \forall U_0 \in D(A) : E(t, U_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim \frac{1}{t^{\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

This is a corollary of one of the main results in [1]. There the authors showed that *stability at rate  $t^{-1/2}$*  for an *abstract* damped wave equation is equivalent to an observability condition for a related Schrödinger equation. Earlier contributions towards (2) were given by [5] and [7].

Having the two bounds (1) and (2) at hand a natural question arises: Are these bounds sharp? Concerning the fast decay rates related to (1) this is partly answered by [5] and [1]. Essentially the authors showed that if the damping function is smooth enough than one can get a decay rate as close to  $t^{-1}$  as we wish. Unfortunately they could not *characterize* the *exact* decay rate in terms of properties of  $a$ . A breakthrough into this direction was achieved in [6] in a slightly different situation (there  $S$  degenerates to a line).

To the best of our knowledge it is completely unknown if the slowest possible rate  $t^{-1/2}$  is attained. To us the only known result towards this direction is due to

Nonnenmacher: If we are in the very particular situation described in subsection 1.1 then

$$\sup_{U_0 \in D(A)} E(t, U_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \gtrsim \frac{1}{t^{\frac{2}{3}}}.$$

See [1, Appendix B]. So this situation is a candidate for the slow decay rate. In this paper we show that Nonnenmacher's bound is actually equal to the exact decay rate.

This of course raises a new question: Is it possible to find a non-vanishing bounded damping in a partially rectangular domain, satisfying the constraints specified above, but discarding the continuity assumptions, such that the exact decay rate for  $E(t, U_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}$  is strictly slower than  $t^{-2/3}$ ? We think this is an interesting question for future research.

**1.4. From waves to stationary waves.** Let  $f \in L^2(\square)$ . Now we consider the stationary damped wave equation with Dirichlet boundary conditions

$$(3) \quad \begin{cases} P(s)u(x, y) = (-\Delta - s^2 + 2isa(x))u(x, y) = f(x, y) & \text{in } \square \\ u(x, y) = 0 & \text{on } \partial\square \end{cases}$$

As already said above, to prove Theorem 1 is essentially to show

**Theorem 3.** *The operator  $P(s) : H^2 \cap H_0^1(\square) \rightarrow L^2(\square)$  from (3) is invertible for every  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ . Moreover*

$$\|P(s)^{-1}\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} \approx 1 + |s|^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Actually we only prove a  $\lesssim$ -inequality since the reverse inequality is a consequence of Nonnenmacher's appendix to [1] together with Proposition 2.4 in the same paper (see Section 4 for more details). Since it is well-known we also do not prove the invertability of  $P(s)$ . The (simple) standard proof is based on testing the homogeneous stationary wave equation with  $\bar{u}$ . From considering real and imaginary part of the resulting expression one easily checks  $u = 0$  by a *unique continuation principle*.

**Acknowledgments.** This paper was inspired and motivated by [1, Appendix B (by S. Nonnenmacher)] and [3]. I am grateful to Ralph Chill for reading and correcting the very first version of this paper.

## 2. NOTATIONS AND CONVENTIONS

*Convention.* Because of the symmetry of (3) we have  $\|P(-s)^{-1}\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} = \|P(s)^{-1}\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2}$ . Therefore in the following we always assume  $s$  to be *positive*.

*Constants.* We use two special constants  $c > 0$  and  $C > 0$ . Special means, that they may change their value from line to line. The difference between these two constants is, that their usage implicitly means that we could always replace  $c$  by a smaller constant and  $C$  by a larger constant - *if this is necessary*. So one should keep in mind that  $c$  is a small number and  $C$  a large number.

*Landau notation.* For this subsection let us denote by  $\phi, \phi_1, \phi_2$  and  $\psi$  complex valued functions defined on  $\mathbb{R} \setminus K$ , where  $K$  is a compact interval. Furthermore we

always assume  $\phi, \phi_1$  and  $\phi_2$  to be real valued and (not necessary strictly) positive. We define

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_1(s) &\lesssim \phi_2(s) :\Leftrightarrow \exists s_0 > 0, C > 0 \forall |s| \geq s_0 : \phi_1(s) \leq C\phi_2(s), \\ \phi_1(s) &\approx \phi_2(s) :\Leftrightarrow \phi_1(s) \lesssim \phi_2(s) \text{ and } \phi_2(s) \lesssim \phi_1(s).\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore we define the following classes (sets) of functions:

$$\begin{aligned}O(\phi(s)) &:= \{\psi; |\psi(s)| \lesssim \phi(s)\}, \\ o(\phi(s)) &:= \{\psi; \forall \varepsilon > 0 \exists s_\varepsilon > 0 \forall |s| \geq s_\varepsilon : |\psi(s)| \leq \varepsilon \phi(s)\}.\end{aligned}$$

By abuse of notation we write for example  $\psi(s) = O(\phi(s))$  instead of  $\psi \in O(\phi(s))$  or  $\phi(s) = \phi_1(s) + O(\phi_2(s))$  instead of  $|\phi(s) - \phi_1(s)| \lesssim \phi_2(s)$ . By  $O(s^{-\infty})$  we denote the intersection of all  $O(s^{-N})$  for  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ .

*Function spaces.* As usual, by  $L^2(\Omega)$  we mean the space of square-integrable functions on some open subset  $\Omega$  of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  for some  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . For  $k$  a natural number  $H^k(\Omega)$  denotes the space of functions from  $L^2(\Omega)$  whose distributional derivatives up to order  $k$  are square integrable, too. Finally the space  $H_0^1(\Omega)$  denotes the closure of the set of compactly supported smooth functions in  $H^1(\Omega)$ . We equip  $H_0^1(\Omega)$  with the norm  $(\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 dx)^{1/2}$  which is equivalent to the usual norm.

### 3. PROOF OF THEOREM 3

Here is the plan for the proof: First we separate the  $y$ -dependence of the stationary wave equation from the problem. As a result we are dealing with a family of one dimensional problems which are parametrized by the vertical wave number  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then we derive explicit solution formulas for the separated problems. These formulas allow us to estimate the solutions of the separated problems by their right-hand side with a constant essentially depending *explicitly* on  $s$  and  $n$ . In the final step we introduce appropriate regimes for  $s$  relative to  $n$  which allow us to drop the  $n$ -dependence of the constant by a (short) case study.

**3.1. Separation of variables.** First recall that the functions  $s_n(y) = \sqrt{2} \sin(n\pi y)$  for  $n \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$  form a complete orthonormal system of  $L^2(0, 1)$ . Thus considering  $u$  and  $f$  satisfying (3) we may write

$$(4) \quad u(x, y) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} u_n(x) s_n(y) \text{ and } f(x, y) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} f_n(x) s_n(y).$$

In terms of this separation of variables the stationary wave equation is equivalent to the one dimensional problem  $P_n(s)u_n = f_n$  where

$$(5) \quad \begin{aligned}P_n(s) &= -\partial_x^2 - k_n^2 + 2isa(x), \text{ and} \\ k_n^2 &= s^2 - (n\pi)^2.\end{aligned}$$

Note that  $k_n$  might be an imaginary number. In a few lines we see that only the real case is important. In that case we choose  $k_n \geq 0$ . But first we prove the following simple

**Lemma 4.** *Let  $\phi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ . Then the estimate  $\|P_n(s)^{-1}\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} \lesssim \phi(s)$  uniformly in  $n$  is equivalent to the estimate  $\|P(s)^{-1}\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} \lesssim \phi(s)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $P(s)u = f$  and expand  $u$  and  $f$  as in (4). Then the implication from the left to the right is a consequence of the following chain of equations and inequalities:

$$\|u\|_{L^2}^2 = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \|u_n\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim \phi(s)^2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \|f_n\|_{L^2}^2 = \phi(s)^2 \|f\|_{L^2}^2.$$

The reverse implication follows from looking at  $f(x, y) = f_n(x)s_n(y)$  and  $u(x, y) = u_n(x)s_n(y)$ .  $\square$

So below we are concerned with the separated stationary wave equation

$$(6) \quad \begin{cases} P_n(s)u_n(x) = f_n(x) & \text{for } x \in (0, 1) \\ u_n(0) = u_n(1) = 0 \end{cases}$$

where  $P_n(s)$  is defined in (5). In view of Lemma 4 we are left to show  $\|u_n\|_{L^2} \lesssim s^{1/2} \|f_n\|_{L^2}$  uniformly in  $n$  in order to prove Theorem 3. It turns out that such an estimate is easy to prove if  $k_n$  is imaginary. More precisely:

**Lemma 5.** *There exists a constant  $c > 0$  such that  $\|P_n(s)^{-1}\|_{L^2 \rightarrow H_0^1} \lesssim 1$  holds uniformly in  $n$  whenever  $s^2 \leq (n\pi)^2 + c$ .*

Note that  $P_n(s)^{-1}$  is considered as an operator mapping to  $H_0^1(0, 1)$ . But it does not really matter since we will only use this estimate after replacing  $H_0^1$  by  $L^2$ .

*Proof.* Testing equation (6) by  $\bar{u}_n$  and taking the real part leads to

$$\int_0^1 |u_n'|^2 - c \int_0^1 |u_n|^2 \leq \int_0^1 |f_n u_n|.$$

Recall that  $\|v'\|_{L^2}^2 \geq \pi^2 \|v\|_{L^2}^2$  for all  $v \in H_0^1(0, 1)$  since  $\pi^2$  is the lowest eigenvalue of the Dirichlet-Laplacian on the unit interval. Thus the conclusion of the Lemma holds for all  $c < \pi^2$ .  $\square$

This lemma allows us to assume

$$(7) \quad k_n = \sqrt{s^2 - (n\pi)^2} > c$$

for some universal constant  $c > 0$  not depending on neither  $s$  nor  $n$ .

**3.2. Explicit formula for  $P_n(s)^{-1}$ .** From now on we consider (6) under the constraint (7). To avoid cumbersome notation we drop the subscript  $n$  from  $k_n$ , i.e. we write  $k$  instead from now on. Next let  $v = u_n|_{[0, \sigma]}$ ,  $g = f_n|_{(0, \sigma)}$  and  $w = u_n|_{[\sigma, 1]}$ ,  $h = f_n|_{(\sigma, 1)}$ . We may write (6) as a coupled system consisting of a wave equation with constant damping and an undamped wave equation:

$$(8) \quad \begin{cases} (-\partial_x^2 - k^2 + 2isa_0)v(x) = g(x) & \text{for } x \in (0, \sigma), \\ (-\partial_x^2 - k^2)w(x) = h(x) & \text{for } x \in (\sigma, 1), \\ v(0) = w(1) = 0, \\ v(\sigma) = w(\sigma), v'(\sigma) = w'(\sigma). \end{cases}$$

**3.2.1. Solution of the homogeneous equation.** The following ansatz satisfies the first three lines of (8) with  $g, h = 0$ :

$$(9) \quad v_0(x) = \frac{1}{k'} \sin(k'x), \quad w_0(x) = \frac{1}{k} \sin(k(1-x)),$$

where  $k'$  is the solution of  $k'^2 = k^2 - 2isa_0$  which has negative imaginary part.

3.2.2. *Solution of the inhomogeneous equation.* The following ansatz satisfies the first three lines of (8):

$$(10) \quad v_g(x) = -\frac{1}{k'} \int_0^x \sin(k'(x-y))g(y)dy, \quad w_h(x) = -\frac{1}{k} \int_x^1 \sin(k(y-x))h(y)dy.$$

This is simply the variation of constants (or Duhamel's) formula. It is useful to know the derivatives of these particular solutions:

$$(11) \quad v'_g(x) = -\int_0^x \cos(k'(x-y))g(y)dy, \quad w'_h(x) = +\int_x^1 \cos(k(y-x))h(y)dy.$$

3.2.3. *General solution.* The general solution of the first three lines of (6) has the form

$$(12) \quad v = av_0 + v_g, \quad w = bw_0 + w_h.$$

Our task is to find the coefficients  $a = a(s, n)$  and  $b = b(s, n)$ . Therefore we have to analyze the coupling condition in line four of (8). A short calculation shows that it is equivalent to

$$\underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} v_0 & -w_0 \\ v'_0 & -w'_0 \end{pmatrix}}_{=: M(s, n)} \bigg|_{x=\sigma} \begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} w_h - v_g \\ w'_h - v'_g \end{pmatrix} \bigg|_{x=\sigma}.$$

From the preceding equation we easily deduce

$$(13) \quad a = \frac{1}{\det M} [w'_0(v_g - w_h) - w_0(v'_g - w_h)]_{x=\sigma},$$

$$(14) \quad b = \frac{1}{\det M} [v'_0(v_g - w_h) - v_0(v'_g - w_h)]_{x=\sigma}.$$

Moreover

$$(15) \quad \det M = \frac{1}{k'} \sin(k'\sigma) \cos(k(1-\sigma)) + \frac{1}{k} \cos(k'\sigma) \sin(k(1-\sigma)).$$

3.3. **Proving a general estimate**  $\|u_n\|_{L^2} \leq C(k, k', M) \|f_n\|_{L^2}$ . For this inequality we will derive an *explicit* formula for  $C$  in terms of  $k, k'$  and  $M$ . In the next subsection we identify the qualitatively different regimes in which  $s$  can live. By *regime* we mean a relation which says how big  $s$  - the full momentum - is compared to  $n\pi$  - the momentum in  $y$ -direction. For each of these regimes we then easily translate the *explicit*  $k, k', M$  dependence of  $C$  to an *explicit* dependence on  $s$ .

3.3.1. *Elementary estimates for  $w_0$  and  $w_h$ .* Directly from the definition of  $w_0$  (see (9)) we deduce

$$(16) \quad \|w_0\|_\infty \leq \frac{1}{k}, \quad \|w'_0\|_\infty \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \|w_0\|_2 \leq \frac{\sqrt{1-\sigma}}{k}.$$

In the same manner for  $w_h$  from (10) and (11) we deduce:

$$(17) \quad \|w_h\|_\infty \leq \frac{\sqrt{1-\sigma}}{k} \|h\|_2, \quad \|w'_h\|_\infty \leq \sqrt{1-\sigma} \|h\|_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \|w_h\|_2 \leq \frac{1-\sigma}{k} \|h\|_2.$$

3.3.2. *Estimating  $w$ .* Recall from (12) that  $w = bw_0 + w_h$ . Recall the formula (14) for  $b$ . Note that

$$(v'_0 v_g - v_0 v'_g)(\sigma) = \frac{1}{k'} \int_0^\sigma \sin(k'y) g(y) dy.$$

Thus it seems to be natural to decompose

$$\begin{aligned} b &= \frac{1}{\det M} [(v_0 w'_h - v'_0 w_h) + (v'_0 v_g - v_0 v'_g)]_{x=\sigma} \\ &=: b_1 + b_2. \end{aligned}$$

This leads to the decomposition of  $w = b_1 w_0 + b_2 w_0 + w_h$  into three parts. With the help of (16) and (17) each part can easily be estimated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} (18) \quad \|b_1 w_0\|_2 &\lesssim \frac{e^{|\Im k'| \sigma}}{|k' \det M|} \left( \frac{1}{k} + \frac{|k'|}{k^2} \right) \|h\|_2, \\ \|b_2 w_0\|_2 &\lesssim \frac{e^{|\Im k'| \sigma}}{|k' \det M|} \frac{1}{k} \|g\|_2, \quad \|w_h\|_2 \lesssim \frac{1}{k} \|h\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

We could now add all three single estimates to get the desired estimate on  $w$  but we wait until we have done the same thing for  $v$ .

3.3.3. *Estimating  $v$ .* Recall from (12) that  $v = av_0 + v_h$ . Recall the formula (13) for  $a$ . Note that

$$\begin{aligned} (w_0 w'_h - w'_0 w_h)(\sigma) &= \frac{1}{k} \int_\sigma^1 \sin(k(1-y)) h(y) dy \text{ and} \\ v_g &= \frac{(-w'_0 v_0 + w_0 v'_0)(\sigma)}{\det M} v_g =: v_{g,2} + v_{g,3}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus it seems to be natural to decompose

$$\begin{aligned} a &= \frac{1}{\det M} [(w_0 w'_h - w'_0 w_h) + w'_0 v_g - w_0 v'_g]_{x=\sigma} \\ &=: a_1 + a_2 + a_3. \end{aligned}$$

This in turn leads to a decomposition of  $v = a_1 v_0 + (a_2 v_0 + v_{g,2}) + (a_3 v_0 + v_{g,3})$  into three parts. Essentially it leaves to find a good representation of the second and the third part of  $v$ . First let us write

$$\begin{aligned} a_2 v_0 + v_{g,2} &= \frac{w'_0(\sigma)}{k' \det M} \underbrace{(v_g(\sigma) \sin(k'x) - k' v_0(\sigma) v_g(x))}_{=: I(x)}, \\ a_3 v_0 + v_{g,3} &= \frac{w_0(\sigma)}{k' \det M} \underbrace{(-v'_g(\sigma) \sin(k'x) + k' v'_0(\sigma) v_g(x))}_{=: II(x)}. \end{aligned}$$

Simple calculations yield

$$\begin{aligned} -2I(x) &= \int_0^\sigma \cos(k'(\sigma - x - y)) g(y) dy - \int_0^x \cos(k'(\sigma - x + y)) g(y) dy \\ &\quad - \int_x^\sigma \cos(k'(\sigma + x - y)) g(y) dy, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$2II(x) = \int_x^\sigma \sin(k'(\sigma + x - y))g(y)dy - \int_0^x \sin(k'(\sigma - x + y))g(y)dy \\ - \int_0^\sigma \sin(k'(\sigma - x + y))g(y)dy.$$

Using this and again the elementary estimates (16) and (17) for  $w_0$  and  $w_h$  we deduce

$$(19) \quad \|a_3 v_0 + v_{g,3}\|_2 \lesssim \frac{e^{|\Im k'| \sigma}}{|k' \det M|} \frac{1}{k} \|g\|_2, \\ \|a_2 v_0 + v_{g,2}\|_2 \lesssim \frac{e^{|\Im k'| \sigma}}{|k' \det M|} \|g\|_2, \quad \|a_1 v_0\|_2 \lesssim \frac{e^{|\Im k'| \sigma}}{|k' \det M|} \frac{1}{k} \|h\|_2.$$

3.3.4. *Conclusion.* Putting (18) and (19) together we get the desired inequality

$$(20) \quad \|u_n\|_{L^2} \lesssim \left[ \frac{e^{|\Im k'| \sigma}}{|k' \det M|} \left( 1 + \frac{|k'|}{k^2} \right) + \frac{1}{k} \right] \|f_n\|_{L^2}.$$

3.4. **Regimes where  $s$  can live.** Keeping (20) in mind, our task is now to find asymptotic dependencies of  $k$  and  $k'$  on  $s$  and a lower bound for  $|k' \det M|$ . A priori there is no unique asymptotic behavior of  $k = \sqrt{s^2 - (n\pi)^2}$  as  $s$  tends to infinity because of  $k$ 's dependence on  $n$ . To overcome this difficulty we introduce the following four *regimes*:

$$(i) \ c \leq k \leq cs^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (ii) \ cs^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq k \leq Cs^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (iii) \ Cs^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq k \leq cs, \quad (iv) \ cs \leq k < s.$$

Recall from Section 2 that  $c$  (resp.  $C$ ) means a small (resp. big) number. Both constants may be different in each regime. But by the convention made in section 2 we may assume that consecutive regimes overlap.

Since we want to investigate the asymptotics  $s \rightarrow \infty$  we always may assume  $s > s_0$  for some sufficiently large number  $s_0 > 0$ .

3.4.1. *Regime (i):*  $c \leq k \leq cs^{\frac{1}{2}}$ . For sufficiently small  $c$  the first order Taylor expansion of the square root at 1 gives a good approximation of

$$k' = \sqrt{2a_0} s^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{i\pi}{4}} \left( 1 + \frac{ik^2}{a_0 s} + O(k^4 s^{-2}) \right).$$

In particular  $\Im k' = -\sqrt{a_0} s^{\frac{1}{2}} (1 + O(k^2 s^{-1}))$  tends with a polynomial rate to minus infinity as  $s$  tends to infinity. Therefore  $\cot(k'\sigma) = i + O(s^{-\infty})$ . Together with (15) this gives us the following useful formula for

$$(21) \quad \det M = \frac{\sin(k'\sigma)}{k'} \left[ \cos(k(1-\sigma)) + \frac{k'}{k} (i + O(s^{-\infty})) \sin(k(1-\sigma)) \right].$$

It is not difficult to see that the term within the brackets is bounded away from zero. Thus  $|k' \det M| \gtrsim \exp(|\Im k'| \sigma)$ . From (20) now follows (recall also (7))

$$\|u_n\|_{L^2} \lesssim \left( 1 + \frac{|k'|}{k^2} \right) \|f_n\|_{L^2} \lesssim s^{\frac{1}{2}} \|f_n\|_{L^2} \quad \text{uniformly in } n.$$

3.4.2. *Regime (ii):*  $cs^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq k \leq Cs^{\frac{1}{2}}$ . Because of  $k'^2 = k^2 - 2isa_0$  we see that both  $\Re k'$  and  $-\Im k'$  are of order  $s^{\frac{1}{2}}$ . Therefore (21) is valid also in this regime. Again the term within the brackets is bounded away from zero. Thus  $|k' \det M| \gtrsim \exp(|\Im k'| \sigma)$  and (20) imply

$$\|u_n\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|f_n\|_{L^2} \text{ uniformly in } n.$$

3.4.3. *Regime (iii):*  $Cs^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq k \leq cs$ . Using first order Taylor expansion for the square root at 1 gives

$$k' = k(1 - ia_0sk^{-2} + O(s^2k^{-4})).$$

In particular: If we choose  $C$  big enough we can assume the ratio  $k'/k$  to be as close to 1 as we wish. Similarly: If we choose  $c$  small enough we may assume  $-\Im k'$  to be as large as we want. Therefore we may assume  $\cot(k'\sigma)$  to be as close to  $i$  as we wish. This means that the following variant of (21) is true for this regime

$$\det M = \frac{\sin(k'\sigma)}{k'} [\cos(k(1-\sigma)) + (i + \varepsilon) \sin(k(1-\sigma))],$$

where  $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{C}$  is some error term with a magnitude as small as we wish. If we choose  $c$  and  $C$  such that  $|\varepsilon| \leq 1/2$  we see that the term within the brackets is bounded away from zero. Thus  $|k' \det M| \gtrsim \exp(|\Im k'| \sigma)$  and (20) imply

$$\|u_n\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|f_n\|_{L^2} \text{ uniformly in } n.$$

3.4.4. *Regime (iv):*  $cs \leq k < s$ . As in the previous regime

$$k' = k(1 - ia_0sk^{-2} + O(s^{-2})).$$

In particular  $k'/k = 1 + O(s^{-1}) \rightarrow 1$  and  $\Im k' = -a_0sk^{-1} + O(s^{-1})$  is bounded away from 0,  $+\infty$  and  $-\infty$ . Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \det M &= \frac{1}{k'} [\sin(k'\sigma) \cos(k(1-\sigma)) + \cos(k'\sigma) \sin(k(1-\sigma))] + O(s^{-2}) \\ &= \frac{\sin(k + (k' - k)\sigma)}{k'} + O(s^{-2}). \end{aligned}$$

This implies that  $|k' \det M| \approx 1$ . Thus from (20) we deduce

$$\|u_n\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|f_n\|_{L^2} \text{ uniformly in } n.$$

**3.5. Conclusion.** Let  $u_n$  solve  $P_n(s)u_n(x) = f_n(x)$ , where  $P_n(s)$  is defined in (5). Section 3.4 together with Lemma 5 shows that the estimate  $\|u_n\|_{L^2} \lesssim s^{1/2} \|f_n\|_{L^2}$  holds uniformly for any  $n$ . Therefore, Lemma 4 implies Theorem 3.

#### 4. EXACT DECAY RATE FOR THE DAMPED WAVE EQUATION

Now we want to prove Theorem 1. Therefore recall the definition of the energy  $E$  and the damped wave operator  $A$  from Section 1. Then [4, Theorem 2.4] together with [2, Proposition 1.3] restricted to our situation says in particular that for any  $\alpha > 0$

$$(22) \quad \sup_{\|U_0\|_{D(A)}=1} E(t, U_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \approx t^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}} \Leftrightarrow \|(is + A)^{-1}\| \approx s^{\alpha}.$$

In [1, Proposition 2.4] it was shown in particular that

$$(23) \quad \|(is + A)^{-1}\| \approx s^{\alpha} \Leftrightarrow \|P(s)^{-1}\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} \approx s^{\alpha-1}.$$

Actually this equivalence is stated there with ‘ $\approx$ ’ replaced by ‘ $\lesssim$ ’. But the ‘ $\gtrsim$ ’-version is included in [1, Lemma 4.6]. In the appendix of [1] Stéphane Nonnenmacher proved

**Proposition 6** (Nonnenmacher, 2014). *The spectrum of  $A$  contains an infinite sequence  $(z_j)$  with  $\Im z_j \rightarrow \infty$  such that  $0 < \Re z_j \lesssim (\Im z_j)^{-3/2}$ .*

Actually he proved this theorem under periodic boundary conditions, but the proof applies also to Dirichlet or Neumann boundary conditions. Note that Proposition 6 together with (23) establishes the ‘ $\gtrsim$ ’-inequality of Theorem 3.

Using (22) and (23) together with Theorem 3 yields Theorem 1.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Nalini Anantharaman and Matthieu Léautaud. Sharp polynomial decay rates for the damped wave equation on the torus. *Anal. PDE*, 7(1):159–214, 2014. ISSN 2157-5045; 1948-206X/e. doi: 10.2140/apde.2014.7.159.
- [2] Charles Batty and Thomas Duyckaerts. Non-uniform stability for bounded semigroups on Banach spaces. *J. Evol. Equ.*, 8(4):765–780, 2008. ISSN 1424-3199; 1424-3202/e. doi: 10.1007/s00028-008-0424-1.
- [3] Charles Batty, Lassi Paunonen, and David Seifert. Optimal energy decay in a one-dimensional coupled wave–heat system. *Journal of Evolution Equations*, pages 1–16, 2016. ISSN 1424-3202. doi: 10.1007/s00028-015-0316-0. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00028-015-0316-0>.
- [4] Alexander Borichev and Yuri Tomilov. Optimal polynomial decay of functions and operator semigroups. *Math. Ann.*, 347(2):455–478, 2010. ISSN 0025-5831; 1432-1807/e. doi: 10.1007/s00208-009-0439-0.
- [5] Nicolas Burq and Michael Hitrik. Energy decay for damped wave equations on partially rectangular domains. *Math. Res. Lett.*, 14(1):35–47, 2007. ISSN 1073-2780; 1945-001X/e. doi: 10.4310/MRL.2007.v14.n1.a3.
- [6] Matthieu Léautaud and Nicolas Lerner. Energy decay for a locally undamped wave equation. arXiv:1411.7271v1, 2014.
- [7] Zhuangyi Liu and Bopeng Rao. Characterization of polynomial decay rate for the solution of linear evolution equation. *Z. Angew. Math. Phys.*, 56(4):630–644, 2005. ISSN 0044-2275; 1420-9039/e. doi: 10.1007/s00033-004-3073-4.
- [8] J.V. Ralston. Solutions of the wave equation with localized energy. *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.*, 22:807–823, 1969. ISSN 0010-3640; 1097-0312/e. doi: 10.1002/cpa.3160220605.

Fachrichtung Mathematik, Institut für Analysis, Technische Universität Dresden, 01062, Dresden, Germany. Email: [Reinhard.Stahn@tu-dresden.de](mailto:Reinhard.Stahn@tu-dresden.de)